

## **Remarks**

### Status

Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-30 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-30 were rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 21 and 26 were objected to.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the subject matter of claim 1.

Applicants have amended claims 15 and 23 to include the limitations of claims 21 and 26 respectively.

Applicants have added claims 31-33. Claim 31 depends from claim 1, similar to claims 21 and 26. Claim 32 is essentially claim 15 plus the clarification added to claim 1, and claim 33 is essentially claim 23 plus the clarification.

Claims 21, 26, 29 and 30 have been canceled by this amendment.

### Rejections

Claims 1-9, 11-14, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois (US 6,793,460) and Wong et al. (US 6,943,773).

DuBois teaches a folding sign, such as a hand-held stop sign, that may have a series of LEDs that allow the letters on the sign to be illuminated, col. 3, lines 9-29, col. 4, lines 1-2. As stated in the office action, DuBois does not teach having addressable display elements to form an image.

Wong teaches a 'page flicking' mechanism for a flexible display in which paginated content is displayed and then, upon receiving an input from a user, the next or previous page of content is displayed, much like a book, col. 2, lines 55-66.

Neither reference, nor the combination thereof, teaches that *each display section is operable to display images when in the expandable configuration the display section is inoperable when collapsed*, as required by amended claim 1. DuBois discloses a sign, so there are no images, and if one were to construe the lettering or word on the sign as an image, it is only visible when the sign is completely expanded. Wong does not teach an expandable/collapsible display. The display in Wong is flexible, but does not have sections that expand and collapse as required in the claim. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong. However, claims 21 and 26 that depend from claims 15 and 23, respectively, were objected to. The office action states that these claims would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Alternatively, Applicants have rewritten the base claims to include the limitations of the dependent claims, putting the independent claims in allowable form. Applicants therefore submit that claims 15 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of all claims is requested.

Claims 16-20, 22, 24, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. in view of DuBois.

Claims 16-20 and 22 depend from claim 15 and claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 depend from claim 23. In light of the amendments to claims 15 and 23, it is submitted that the dependent claims of these claims are also patentably distinguishable over the prior and should be ruled allowable.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois in view of Wong et al and further in view of Comiskey et al (US 6,473,072).

The combination of DuBois and Wong does not teach all of the elements of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends, much less the further limitations of claim 10. Comiskey does not overcome these deficiencies. Applicants therefore submit that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Newly added claim 31 presents the subject matter of claims 21 or 26 to depend from claim 1. As the subject matter of those claims was found to be allowable, the subject matter of claim 31 should be ruled allowable as well.

Newly added claims 32 and 33 are the subject matter of claims 15 and 23, respectively, with the added limitation that clarifies claim 1. For the reasons as applied to claim 1, above, it is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not deemed pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 65650**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street  
Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613